

the sentence upon which the democratic party has built its anti-trust policy; namely, "A private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable."

6th. He urged in 1898 the declaration of the nation's purpose to give independence to the Filipinos, and he continued to write the doctrine in democratic platforms until, under Mr. Wilson's first administration, the promise was solemnly given by resolution of congress, and the giving of the promise put the United States in position to lead the world in the fight for democracy and the right of self-determination.

7th. He secured the incorporation in the currency act of the provision restoring to the government the sovereign right to issue money—a right which had been surrendered to the national banks. It was the incorporation of this provision that made it possible to pass the measure.

8th. He led the fight for publicity as to campaign contributions—publicity BEFORE the election.

9th. He supported the rural credits law.

10th. He has been an advocate of tariff reform for thirty-eight years and helped to draw the revenue laws of 1892 and 1894.

11th. He has for twenty-five years urged the guaranty of bank deposits, and has seen the idea adopted in several states and indorsed by the comptroller of the currency, John Skilton Williams—the best comptroller the nation has had in a generation.

12th. He has urged laws to prevent profiteering.

13th. He has for twenty-two years advocated the initiative and referendum (a reform which has recently been adopted in Massachusetts in spite of the Herald's opposition).

14th. He has urged a system of good roads, the national ownership of telegraph lines and government ownership (the dual plan) of telephones and railroads.

15th. He proposed in 1905 and between 1913 and 1915 embodied in treaties with three-quarters of the world the plan whereby ALL disputes are to be INVESTIGATED before a resort to hostilities—a plan which seems to have been accepted as the basis of the league of nations.

If any excuse is necessary for this review of twenty-eight years of political activity it can be found in the fact that so intelligent a leader of thought as the Herald should be unacquainted with the record.

WHO DO THEY REPRESENT?

The Nebraska legislature, by a unanimous vote of both branches, requested Senator Hitchcock to vote for the submission by congress of the equal suffrage constitutional amendment for ratification by the states.

The legislature of Ohio passed a joint resolution instructing Ohio senators to vote in favor of suffrage, the joint vote being 102 for and 41 against. The constituents of Senator Hitchcock and Senator Pomerene are overwhelmingly in favor of the submission of the suffrage amendment and yet these senators voted against it. We are supposed to have a representative form of government. Who do these senators represent?

THE MARCH TOWARD MONOPOLY

The advocates of private ownership of railroads a few weeks ago ventured to suggest that the railroads should be consolidated into twenty-five or fifty systems. Now they advise six to twelve systems. The march toward monopoly is as steady as the march to the grave, so long as the monopoly is in private hands. Soon they will suggest two or three and then ONE. That is the end in view. The only alternative is GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP—and the dual plan is the easiest, best and safest.

THE PROFITEER

The profiteer was the one dark spot on the conduct of the war. While the soldiers at the front were giving their blood for their country the profiteer was bleeding the public. He deserves no mercy. Where he exploits on a national scale he should feel the force of national laws; where he confines his ravages to a state he should be prosecuted by the state authorities, while petty offenders should be amenable to municipal ordinances. To properly deal with the offenders big and little immediate action should be taken in every state to create state trade commissions and to authorize municipal trade commissions. No time should be lost—the states should act at once.

W. J. BRYAN.

"A LITTLE SERVICE, PLEASE"



— From Baltimore News.

GIVE HIS NAME

The New York Times publishes the following under the heading of "Prohibition at Work":

"To the Editor of the New York Times: The prohibitionists are to be congratulated on their success in making the country safe for hypocrisy. None but the most verdantly unsophisticated believe that our legislators, national and state, will practice the total abstinence from intoxicants which they are forcing on the people. Already senators and representatives here are rapidly providing cases for the future Sahara. Lockers in the capitol and cellars in homes are being replenished. Limousines roll in from Baltimore daily with the precious freight, and the Adams Express office transformed into a whole sale liquor establishment, is a social gathering place where the best-gowned women in Washington wait patiently to receive their packages. Which means that the solons of every state, as well as of the nation, as well as all other persons of sufficient means, will be able to procure, before prohibition becomes effective, enough liquid solace for a long time ahead—in case of the wealthy, for the remainder of their lives. The great mass of the plain people, the mechanic, the poorly paid clerk, the small storekeeper, whose drab lot of hard toil or monotonous occupation is somewhat relieved and brightened by an occasional glass of beer partaken in cheerful and congenial company, will be deprived of what their more fortunate fellow-citizens can still enjoy—those to whom many sources of physical and mental exhilaration—travel, golf, art, opera—are open. A year from now, Senator Croesus will have ten thousand dollars' worth of champagne in his cellar; John Smith will, maybe, have a dozen bottles of beer in his ice chest. Is this a square deal. Is John Smith going to submit to it?—A Clergyman, Washington, D. C., January 28, 1919."

Is the Times SURE that the correspondent is a clergyman? Will it give the name and address of the minister who will in this day defend the use of intoxicants? If not, it is unfair to publish such a reflection on the ministry.

A LITTLE PATIENCE, PLEASE

Some of the republican papers are kicking because the democrats have raised the tariff on high priced soap. These protectionists should be patient—they will control congress after March and can go back to the good old republican plan and put a SPECIFIC duty of 15 cents a pound on soap as they used to do—which means 15 per cent on a dollar-a-pound soap and 100 per cent on a fifteen-cent-a-pound soap.

THE BIG HOTELS' REASON

The big New York hotels seem to be the chief mourners at John Barleycorn's funeral. Why? Because they profited more than any other class in proportion to money invested. They paid no higher license than the little saloons but they had a bigger trade and sold higher priced drinks. If they get into the limelight congress may investigate their bar receipts and expose their real interest.

Groundless Objection

One of the objections made to the dual plan of railroad ownership is that the federal government would be able to charge a lower rate on the trunk line system than the states could afford on the local lines. The answer is obvious, the traffic must bear the cost whether the lines are under one management or several. At present a big system averages the rates, which means that the trunk lines charge more than necessary in order that freight can be carried at less than cost on branch lines, but the total is the same that it would be if each mile of road earned the same dividend on money invested. If the federal government charges less on trunk lines than the roads now charge on their trunk lines, the states can charge more on the branches without increasing the total rate which usually includes both.

Government ownership reduces charges in the operation of municipal plants and it is reasonable to suppose that the same result will follow government ownership of railroads under normal conditions and in the hands of those who want government ownership to succeed.

But if the cost would be greater under dual ownership than under the nationalization of all the lines, the latter is impossible at present and, even if possible, the political advantages of dual ownership in building up the states as units in our government would outweigh any increase in cost.

W. J. BRYAN.

WHICH IS RIGHT?

Mr. Bryan has received the following letter from a subscriber—name and address are withheld out of consideration for the writer. There is evidently a wide difference of opinion. Time will decide which is right. The letter follows:

"Dear Sir: I am in receipt of your letter of 26th inst. In regard to my renewal of The Commoner, I have been a subscriber for several years and enjoyed reading it very much till Mr. Bryan went crazy about woman's suffrage and I have been burning them up to get them off of my desk as fast as I could find one with a long article about woman's suffrage in it. I am sure that a greater curse could never be put on the people than woman's suffrage; if we have to put up with either let's have the liquor, for woman's suffrage will cause the death of 10 men where liquor will cause one. God never intended for the women to have equal rights with the men or he would have fixed it that way in the beginning, the Bible is strictly against it and I can never support it or ask any of my friends to support it so you can cancel my subscription at your earliest convenience."

STATES INDORSE WOMAN SUFFRAGE

The following states have officially requested congress to submit the suffrage constitutional amendment to the states for ratification: Texas, Oregon, Washington, Wisconsin, Utah, California, Michigan, North Dakota, New York, Colorado, Indiana, South Dakota, Arizona, Minnesota, Arkansas, Ohio and Nebraska.

INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM

The initiative and referendum make the government a people's government, and a people's government avoids violence by using ballots instead of bullets.

With the unemployed increasing, NOW is the time to use surplus labor on the public roads. No soldier should be compelled to wait in idleness for an opportunity to work.

REFERENDUM WILL NOT AID WETS

The wets, after opposing the initiative and referendum for years for fear it would aid prohibition, are now clamoring for a referendum. They insist that the PEOPLE shall be consulted. All right. Whenever the people put the initiative and referendum in the constitution so that it can be invoked on all questions there will be no objection to its being used on the liquor question, but the wets will not be permitted to apply the doctrine to the liquor question only.

The supreme court is not likely to overthrow the provision of the federal constitution which confers the right to ratify upon LEGISLATURES—not upon the ELECTORS, but even if a referendum were ordered in the states that have a referendum the wets could not carry a single state against prohibition. JOHN BARLEYCORN IS DEAD.

W. J. BRYAN.